## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

JEFFREY CLYDE JOBE,

Plaintiff,

٧.

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS HEALTH SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-00245-SLG

## ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Before the Court at Docket 39 is Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Plaintiff did not file a response to the motion. The motion was referred to the Honorable Magistrate Judge Kyle F. Reardon. At Docket 46, Judge Reardon issued a Report and Recommendation, in which he recommended that the motion be granted and that Plaintiff's claims at Docket 1 be dismissed with prejudice. No objections to the Report and Recommendation were filed.

The matter is now before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). That statute provides that a district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." A court is to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge's report

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made."2 However, § 636(b)(1) does not "require district court review of a magistrate's factual or legal conclusions, under a de novo or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings."<sup>3</sup>

The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court grant Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and agrees with its analysis. Accordingly, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation, and IT IS ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED. Plaintiff's claims at Docket 1 are DISMISSED with prejudice. The Clerk of Court shall enter a final judgment accordingly.

DATED this 29th day of February, 2024, at Anchorage, Alaska.

<u>/s/ Sharon L. Gleason</u> UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> *Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003).